

fix the problem of airline security. And clearly, as the Senate has said in a unanimous voice, the way we fix security in the airline industry is by federalizing it.

We must make sure that our airports are like our borders. We would not privatize the border line with individuals to monitor the borders, nor can we do that with our airlines.

If we want to go back to normal, if we want our business community to resume itself, we must make it safe for them to fly, because that is what is going to help stimulate our economy so we can get back to normal and we can begin to focus on the things that are important to all Americans. We cannot do it until people feel safe flying, and the only way we can do that is by federalizing.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2311, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 272 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 272

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2311) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

House Resolution 272 provides for consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2311, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 2002. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration and provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, this is a noncontroversial conference report, and I am asking for us to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

I want to congratulate the conferees on their hard work and urge passage of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge Members to support this rule and this conference report. Both the House and the Senate passed this bill on a bipartisan basis, and this conference report also represents a bipartisan, bicameral compromise.

Additionally, this conference report contains provisions that are very important to the people that I represent in north Texas. It provides \$5.5 million in critical funding for a flood control project along Johnson Creek in Arlington, Texas. It provides \$10 million for the Dallas Floodway Extension, and it provides \$1.2 for the Trinity River Basin. The final funding that each of us will receive meets the needs identified by the Army Corps of Engineers and local authorities.

The conference report also provides \$1 million for a state of the art annex to the Science Center at Texas Wesleyan University, which serves neighborhood children as well as students in a historic inner-city neighborhood on the east side of Fort Worth, Texas.

□ 1030

I also want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) for working with me to fund these critical provisions for north Texas.

This is a good bill, Mr. Speaker, and the conferees should be commended for doing the best they could under the circumstances. But as many of them will tell us, they were hamstrung by the fact that the Senate originally passed these bills before September 11.

Since that infamous date, Mr. Speaker, all of us have become acutely aware of the massive security needs facing America. This bill does not reflect many of the priorities of today's new war against terrorism.

For instance, the conference report provides no additional funds to address terrorist threats related to nuclear weapons plants or Department of Energy labs. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) offered an amendment to beef up the Nation's nonproliferation activities that prevent terrorists from getting Russian nuclear materials. Indeed, the administration had proposed cutting \$98 million from this critical program.

Fortunately, this conference report restores \$81 million to this vital program, but that is still \$17 million below last year's level.

Overall, the Federal agencies funded by this bill have identified about \$1.2 billion in additional security needs, but this conference report funds only \$287 million of that, leaving us about \$900 million short.

Since September 11, Mr. Speaker, America's security needs have increased, not decreased. The safety of every American depends on whether this Congress and this President will invest more, not less, in meeting them.

So after we pass this conference report today, it is crucial that all of us work together to immediately ensure all of our homeland security needs are fully funded. There is no higher priority.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), for putting together this energy and water appropriation bill on a genuine bipartisan basis. This bill, because of their leadership, funds vital flood control and water projects for communities throughout the Nation. It funds important energy and research programs.

I also commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) for working hard to plus up about \$85 million in the administration's ill-advised and dangerous budget proposal that would have cut \$100 million from our programs designed to keep nuclear material and weapons out of the hands of terrorists.

I know this bill will pass by a strong margin on a bipartisan basis because of all the good things in it. However, Mr. Speaker, in good conscience I cannot remain silent about some decisions that have been made by this Congress, some of which go beyond the authority of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development.

I find it unbelievable, Mr. Speaker, unbelievable that just 1 week ago this House said that we could afford to give \$7.4 billion in unearned corporate rebate checks to just 16 Fortune 500 corporations. Yet, this Congress to date will have cut programs designed to keep nuclear weapons and materials away from terrorists.

I find it irresponsible and dangerous that even in light of the September 11 terrorist attacks, this House has said, in effect, by our votes that giving special huge tax breaks to corporations like General Motors, they got nearly \$1 billion, IBM got \$1.4 billion, General Electric a little under \$1 billion, that those tax rebate checks to those corporations are more important than protecting 281 million Americans and their families from the threat of nuclear terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, a recent report from a committee co-chaired by Republican former Senator Howard Baker and former Senator Sam Nunn, a Democrat, said that the threat of nuclear terrorism against the United States is the single most important national security concern facing this Nation.

I do not question anyone's intentions in this House. I believe genuinely that every one of us in this House shares the belief that protecting Americans' lives and security is the first responsibility of our government. But in government,

good intentions do not count if our budget decisions undermine the principles we preach.

We can talk about homeland defense all we want, but may God help us in our war on terrorism if this Congress decides corporate tax rebate checks are more important than keeping nuclear weapons out of the hands of terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention five facts about the possibility of nuclear terrorism against American citizens:

Fact No. 1, had the September 11 terrorists been able to use a nuclear bomb built with a Coke can size of plutonium and placed it in a car in Lower Manhattan, over 2 million American citizens, not 5,000, would have been killed;

Fact No. 2, there are over 600 metric tons, enough for 41,000 nuclear devices, of weapons-usable material in Russia that is in urgent need, urgent need of additional security improvements, according to our own U.S. Department of Energy;

Fact No. 3, we know of 14 separate seizures of highly-enriched, bomb-grade uranium that had been stolen from Russian nuclear sites since 1992. Frighteningly, in eight of those 14 cases the uranium was not seized until it had escaped out of Russia, and was found in Germany, the Czech Republic, and Bulgaria;

Fact No. 4, we know that since 1993 Osama bin Laden and his al-Qaeda organization have made attempts to obtain nuclear material from Russia;

Fact No. 5, because of an agreement just signed on September 26 of this year, just last month, between the United States and Russia, we have a window of opportunity to put in place antiterrorist safeguards at numerous Russian nuclear sites, some of which we have never been able to visit prior to this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, no one knows when that window of opportunity might close. I believe it would be dangerous for this Congress not to take advantage of such a chance and carry out our responsibility to get better control of Russian nuclear material so it will not some day, God forbid, end up in a major American city as part of a terrorist bomb.

Based on these known five facts and the devastating potential of nuclear terrorist attacks, I believe strongly that Congress should act immediately, not next month, not the month after that, not next year, but we should act immediately to work with Russia in providing adequate safeguards at their numerous nuclear sites.

I find it hard to believe, frankly, that in this energy and water appropriation bill we are adding \$400 million to improve the U.S. offensive nuclear arsenal, which everyone would agree in all nations is by far the most powerful nuclear force in the world; yet, in my opinion, we are cutting what is gen-

erally considered the single most effective program in keeping nuclear materials out of the hands of terrorists: a materials prevention and control accounting program.

Mr. Speaker, I know every single Member of this House would do almost anything, personally or publicly, to prevent a nuclear terrorist attack on the United States. Sadly, though, sadly, though, our spending and tax decisions in this Congress are not consistent with that commitment.

I believe the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), who already worked hard to support these programs, are genuine in their efforts to convince this House and the other body that we in this Congress have a moral obligation to the American people to do everything possible to prevent terrorists from using nuclear weapons against the American family.

If the decisionmakers beyond the scope of this appropriations subcommittee's jurisdiction do not this year either expand the budget allocation for nuclear nonproliferation programs or add significant funding in the supplemental appropriations bill, if we fail to do that, then we will have failed the American people in our sworn oath to protect and defend them.

We know terrorists are at war with us. If we Americans are truly at war with them, then this Congress must make homeland defense our top priority, not just our favorite rhetoric.

The clock is ticking and our children's future is at risk. I intend to work with the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), and other Members of this Congress who agree that we must act now, immediately, to ensure that our families and children never have to witness an American holocaust perpetrated by nuclear terrorists.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

In response to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas about the shortages that are apparent in our bill for the nuclear nonproliferation account, certainly he is correct. However, we have assured him, and we discussed this at great length in conference, that we are going to correct that in some supplemental bill somewhere before the end of the year.

He is absolutely right, the commission that President Clinton put together, including former Senator Sam Nunn and Susan Eisenhower, have come to us and they have told us of the serious need for additional funds. We are going to find those funds. There were just no more additional funds available in this bill.

I assure the gentleman from Texas and assure this Congress that we are going to provide adequate resources to this administration to ensure that the nonproliferation agreement works.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I would just like to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), who just spoke, for his leadership to date on this effort. I am convinced had it not been for his work, along with that of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), we would be looking at this administration's proposed \$100 million cut in nonproliferation nuclear programs.

I would have been much more comfortable had I been able to say to my colleagues and the American people that we are taking care of this problem today in this energy and water appropriation bill, but I failed in my effort to add an amendment which would have given \$131 million extra to these programs.

But I appreciate the leadership of the chairman to date, what he has already done, and I am especially deeply grateful for his commitment to this Congress to continue those efforts and see that we adequately fund this budget, in light of what has happened September 11. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, a number of years ago, right after the Soviet Union collapsed, I was at a bipartisan conference in Budapest and we met with a series of Soviet and Russian officials. Among those in attendance was the then Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrov and the Deputy Defense Minister Andre Kokoshin.

Also present at that meeting were a number of Members of this House and the other body, such as Senators Nunn, LUGAR, Congressman Aspin, who later went on to become Secretary of Defense, Senator LEVIN, myself, and a number of others.

We were asked by two Russian officials if we could come into a private hotel room to discuss a very serious situation, so we gathered. They described to us their terror at the lack of security relative to the kind of nuclear material which the gentleman from Texas just discussed.

As a result of those discussions, the Nunn-Lugar program was born. This country then began an effort to try to slowly but surely pull nuclear weapons from the various Soviet provinces into Russia itself so there would be better control over those weapons. And in addition, this country began, at the urging of the Russians, who were most

concerned about it, we began a variety of programs to try to help not only secure nuclear material from warheads, but we also began to think about what we were going to do about the fact that we had many, many Russian and Soviet scientists who were out of work, who had very little income, and who were very easy pickings for terrorist groups all around the world who might want to find a way to get knowledge they did not have or to obtain nuclear material that they did not have.

□ 1045

Our efforts to fund those programs have been sporadic at best since that time; and in my view, that is leading ever more inexorably to a serious, serious problem and perhaps even at some point a crisis.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) has pointed out to you that, even with the meager funds we have put into these programs, on eight occasions authorities have seized nuclear materiel that was in the wrong hands and had already been secreted out of Russia itself. Four of those recoveries took place in Germany; three took place in the Czech Republic; one in Bulgaria. In addition, there were six other incidences during which materiel was recovered within Russia itself that had fallen into the wrong hands, and we do not know how many other examples there are of this materiel falling into the wrong hands.

Now, under those circumstances, one would think that we would make as our number one priority securing that threat. We have not done so. We have had a lot of sporadic effort, but we have not accomplished what we needed to accomplish.

The Department of Defense has responsibilities in this area; so does the Department of Energy. This bill corrects to a large extent the budget reductions made by the administration in the program that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) just described; but in my view, we have an obligation to go far beyond what was merely provided last year in order to really get a handle on this problem.

Now, the problem that we have in addition to this is that DOE has told us that they have at least \$1.2 billion of additional needs, and they have been funded only to a very small extent in this bill because of funding limitations imposed on it by the allocation.

In addition to that, we have been told that there are at least half a billion dollars' worth of defense funding requirements relating to nuclear materiel that we ought to be providing for recovery programs here or for security programs within our own country, and very little of that is being responded to.

Those requirements are far beyond what was included in the fiscal 2002 budget or the House or the Senate bill.

It just seems to me that a Congress that can provide \$25 billion in tax gifts to General Electric, to AT&T and to other truly needy people in this society like that, and I am being sarcastic, Mr. Speaker, when I say that, it seems to me that if Congress can find the money to provide that kind of gift to the non-needy, we certainly ought to have enough common sense to find enough room in our budget to deal with one of the most serious security problems that faces this country and this planet.

I regard the lack of funding across DOE for a number of programs not even mentioned here today, including one that I brought to the attention of the committee in a private session, I regard the neglect of those vulnerabilities to be almost criminal negligence, not on the part of this committee but on the part of people in the Government who know the serious problems and vulnerabilities that exist out there that are not being dealt with.

Now, I love to give tax cuts as much as the next man; but our first obligation in this instance is to secure the home front. We are not doing it sufficiently with this bill. We are not doing it sufficiently with other bills that will be before this Congress; and until we do, we are failing our principal obligation to protect the public safety of each and every citizen that we represent.

That is why, despite many of the good things in this bill, I will be voting against this bill to try to indicate my extreme concern about the lack of attention and the lack of follow-through on these problems.

I appreciate the consideration of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) when he says we will try to deal with this in a future bill. My suggestion to the House is that I think, if this is a high priority, it ought to be dealt with immediately. It is not, and that is why I am going to be voting against this bill.

This is not due to any negligence on the part of the subcommittee chairman or the ranking member, any of the subcommittee members; but in my view the priorities of this Congress, given this problem, I think these priorities are misbegotten.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the majority wishes to reserve its time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the majority that we have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this rule, which will allow us to consider this important conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 2, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 415]

YEAS—421

Abercrombie	Conyers	Graham
Ackerman	Cooksey	Granger
Aderholt	Costello	Graves
Akin	Cox	Green (TX)
Allen	Coyne	Green (WI)
Andrews	Cramer	Greenwood
Armey	Crane	Grucci
Baca	Crenshaw	Gutierrez
Bachus	Crowley	Gutknecht
Baird	Culberson	Hall (TX)
Baker	Cummings	Hansen
Baldacci	Cunningham	Harman
Baldwin	Davis (CA)	Hart
Ballenger	Davis (FL)	Hastings (FL)
Barcia	Davis (IL)	Hastings (WA)
Barr	Davis, Jo Ann	Hayes
Barrett	Davis, Tom	Hayworth
Bartlett	Deal	Hefley
Barton	DeFazio	Hill
Bass	DeGette	Hilleary
Becerra	Delahunt	Hilliard
Bentsen	DeLauro	Hinchey
Bereuter	DeLay	Hinojosa
Berman	DeMint	Hobson
Berry	Deusch	Hoefel
Biggert	Diaz-Balart	Hoekstra
Bilirakis	Dicks	Holden
Bishop	Dingell	Holt
Blagojevich	Doggett	Honda
Blumenauer	Dooley	Hooley
Blunt	Doolittle	Horn
Boehlert	Doyle	Hostettler
Boehner	Dreier	Houghton
Bonilla	Duncan	Hoyer
Bonior	Edwards	Hulshof
Bono	Ehlers	Hunter
Borski	Ehrlich	Hyde
Boswell	Emerson	Inlee
Boucher	Engel	Isakson
Boyd	English	Israel
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Issa
Brady (TX)	Etheridge	Istook
Brown (OH)	Evans	Jackson (IL)
Brown (SC)	Everett	Jackson-Lee
Bryant	Farr	(TX)
Burr	Fattah	Jefferson
Burton	Ferguson	Jenkins
Buyer	Filner	John
Callahan	Flake	Johnson (CT)
Calvert	Fletcher	Johnson (IL)
Camp	Foley	Johnson, E. B.
Cannon	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Cantor	Ford	Jones (NC)
Capito	Fossella	Jones (OH)
Capps	Frank	Kanjorski
Capuano	Frelinghuysen	Kaptur
Cardin	Frost	Keller
Carson (IN)	Gallegly	Kelly
Carson (OK)	Ganske	Kennedy (MN)
Castle	Gekas	Kennedy (RI)
Chabot	Gephardt	Kerns
Chambliss	Gibbons	Kildee
Clay	Gilchrest	Kilpatrick
Clayton	Gillmor	Kind (WI)
Clement	Gilman	King (NY)
Clyburn	Gonzalez	Kingston
Coble	Goode	Kirk
Collins	Goodlatte	Klecza
Combest	Gordon	Knollenberg
Condit	Goss	Kolbe

Kucinich	Oberstar	Sherman
LaFalce	Obey	Sherwood
LaHood	Olver	Shimkus
Lampson	Ortiz	Shows
Langevin	Osborne	Shuster
Lantos	Ose	Simmons
Largent	Otter	Simpson
Larsen (WA)	Owens	Skeen
Larson (CT)	Oxley	Skelton
Latham	Pallone	Slaughter
LaTourette	Pascarella	Smith (MI)
Leach	Pastor	Smith (NJ)
Lee	Paul	Smith (TX)
Levin	Payne	Smith (WA)
Lewis (CA)	Pelosi	Snyder
Lewis (GA)	Pence	Solis
Lewis (KY)	Peterson (MN)	Souder
Linder	Peterson (PA)	Spratt
Lipinski	Petri	Stearns
LoBiondo	Phelps	Stenholm
Lofgren	Pickering	Strickland
Lowey	Pitts	Stump
Lucas (KY)	Platts	Stupak
Lucas (OK)	Pombo	Sununu
Luther	Pomeroy	Sweeney
Lynch	Portman	Tancred
Maloney (CT)	Price (NC)	Tanner
Maloney (NY)	Pryce (OH)	Tauscher
Manzullo	Putnam	Tauzin
Markey	Quinn	Taylor (MS)
Mascara	Radanovich	Taylor (NC)
Matheson	Rahall	Terry
Matsui	Ramstad	Thomas
McCarthy (MO)	Rangel	Thompson (CA)
McCarthy (NY)	Regula	Thornberry
McCollum	Rehberg	Thune
McDermott	Reyes	Thurman
McGovern	Reynolds	Tiahrt
McHugh	Riley	Tiberi
McInnis	Rivers	Tierney
McIntyre	Rodriguez	Toomey
McKeon	Roemer	Towns
McKinney	Rogers (KY)	Traficant
McNulty	Rogers (MI)	Turner
Meehan	Rohrabacher	Udall (CO)
Meek (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Udall (NM)
Meeks (NY)	Ross	Upton
Menendez	Rothman	Velázquez
Mica	Roukema	Visclosky
Millender-	Roybal-Allard	Vitter
McDonald	Royce	Walden
Miller, Dan	Rush	Walsh
Miller, Gary	Ryan (WI)	Wamp
Miller, George	Ryun (KS)	Waters
Miller, Jeff	Sabo	Watkins (OK)
Mink	Sánchez	Watson (CA)
Mollohan	Sanders	Watt (NC)
Moore	Sandlin	Watts (OK)
Moran (KS)	Sawyer	Waxman
Moran (VA)	Saxton	Weiner
Morella	Schaffer	Weldon (FL)
Murtha	Schakowsky	Weldon (PA)
Myrick	Schiff	Weller
Nadler	Schrock	Whitfield
Napolitano	Scott	Wicker
Neal	Sensenbrenner	Wilson
Nethercutt	Serrano	Wolf
Ney	Sessions	Woolsey
Northup	Shadegg	Wu
Norwood	Shaw	Wynn
Nussle	Shays	Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Berkley Stark

NOT VOTING—9

Brown (FL)	Hall (OH)	Thompson (MS)
Cubin	Herger	Wexler
Dunn	McCrery	Young (AK)

□ 1116

Messrs. STEARNS, SHAYS and ABERCROMBIE changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report accompanying H.R. 2311, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2311, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 272, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2311) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 272, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 30, 2001, at page H7418.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House the conference report on H.R. 2311, the fiscal year 2002 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

At the outset, I would like to state how pleased I am that the conference committee was able to work out the dramatic differences between the House and Senate bills so amicably and to such a positive effect. Given the great divide over the House and Senate priorities, many concluded that we would never be able to resolve our differences. Not only did we resolve those differences, we did so in such a way that the critical priorities of the House and Senate were carefully protected.

I am proud of the agreement struck between the House and Senate on energy and water development programs. It was a difficult and arduous negotiation, but the product of our deliberations is a package that will help strengthen our defense, rebuild our critical infrastructure, and increase our scientific knowledge.

The total amount included in the conference agreement for energy and water programs is \$24.6 billion. This is \$891 million over the amount included in the House-passed bill and about \$2.1 billion over the budget request.

I am especially pleased with the level of funding we have recommended for

the civil works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. At \$4.5 billion, the recommended funding is \$586 million higher than the administration's inadequate budget request. The majority of this increase, about \$391 million, is in the Corps' construction program. While that may sound like a large increase, the amount we have recommended is about the same as the amount the Corps spent in fiscal year 2001 on construction. If we had funded the construction program at the level requested by the administration, the result would have been schedule delays, increased project costs, and the loss of project benefits.

For the Bureau of Reclamation, we have provided \$914 million, which is \$95 million above the budget request.

For the nondefense programs of the Department of Energy, we were able to provide modest increases over the last year for several programs. The basic research performed by the Department of Energy has led to many of the technological breakthroughs that have helped our economy grow. These programs will even be more important as we move into the 21st century.

I am pleased to report that the additional allocation we received has enabled us to fund these programs slightly above the levels requested by the administration. For renewable energy programs, we were able to provide about \$19 million over the House-passed level.

For the Atomic Energy Defense Programs of the Department of Energy, the conference agreement includes \$14.7 billion, a significant increase of almost \$1.2 billion over the budget request. These funds will ensure that we have a reliable and safe nuclear weapons stockpile, continue to fund important nuclear nonproliferation programs to secure nuclear materials in Russia, and meet our commitments to communities throughout the United States to clean up the damage done to the environment over the past 40 years.

I want to thank my Senate counterpart, Chairman HARRY REID, and his ranking minority member, Senator PETE DOMENICI, for their cooperation and hard work. Moreover, I would like to expression my sincere appreciation to my colleagues on the House Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, whose devoted efforts made this conference report possible.

I am especially grateful to my good friend and ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY). I want to thank our full committee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for their cooperation in enabling us to bring this conference report before the House today.

Finally, I would like to express my deep appreciation and sincere gratitude to the House Appropriations staff for the Subcommittee for Energy and